

- 1 of 4 -

NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF BONA FIDE
OFFER IN COMPROMISE DATED 2/6/2014
#2:14-CR-00027-NDF-2 (USDC/DWY)

Margin
Notes:

TO: Office of Presiding Judge (duly credentialed)
District Court of the United States ("DC US")
2120 Capitol Ave., 2nd Floor
Cheyenne 82001-3658
Wyoming, USA

DATE: 6/17/2014 A.D.

To All Whom it May Concern:

The Undersigned hereby formally withdraws
the "Bona Fide Offer in Compromise" dated Feb. 6,
2014, in good causes including that not
limited to the following:

(1) the "MOTION FOR PSYCHIATRIC OR PSYCHOLOGICAL
EXAMINATION" by Messrs. CROFTS and MURRAY,
dated March 26, 2014, was not timely served
upon the Undersigned; no NOTICE of any hearing
on said MOTION was ever served upon the
Undersigned; and, no hearing on said MOTION
was ever conducted on said MOTION with the
Undersigned being present;

(2) Messrs. CROFTS and MURRAY have failed to
produce all credentials required by 28 U.S.C.
544 and 5 U.S.C. 3331, 3332, 3333, 5507 and 2906;
and, as such, neither enjoys lawful authority
legally to represent "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA" [sic]
whatever THAT is: see also 28 U.S.C. 530B
(McDade Act); Delaware Secretary of State ("SOS").

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF WYOMING
2014 JUN 24 PM 12:04
STEPHAN HARRIS, CLERK
CHEYENNE

28 USC 544;
5 USC 3331,
3332, 3333,
5507, 2906

28 USC 530B

- 1 of 4 -

- 1 of 4 -

- 2 of 4 -

28 USC 1965;
28 USC 544

(3) lacking said required credentials and power of attorney, both CROFTS and MURRAY were banned from stepping one foot into a Federal Grand Jury room, with or without the presence of any qualified jurors: here, see U.S. v. Pignatelli (re: 28 U.S.C. 544 (A)(1));

28 USC 951;
5 USC 2104,
2903, 2906,
3331, 3332,
3333, 5507;
18 USC 912, 2

(4) both CROFTS and MURRAY either knew, or should have known, the Federal statutes expressly imposed also on Clerk's Office personnel, such as 28 U.S.C. 951, and 5 U.S.C. 2104, 2903, 2906, 3331, 3332, 3333, and 5507: ignorance of those laws is no excuse for violating, or aiding and abetting violations of, those laws; see 18 U.S.C. 2, 912;

18 USC 1964

(5) the Undersigned is authorized by Act of Congress at 18 U.S.C. 1964 and decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, like Rotella v. Wood and Agency Holding v. Matley-Duff, to act on behalf of the United States as a "Private Attorney General": see, in particular, the "objectives of Civil RICO" as clearly stated in Rotella supra; evidently, CROFTS and MURRAY have stubbornly failed to read and understand the controlling paragraphs in Rotella; this failure is truly pathetic!

18 USC 1964

- 2 of 4 -

(6) Agency Holding supra is even more poignant, where it explains the legislative intent of 18 U.S.C. 1964 as supplementing, by law,

- 2 of 4 -

- 3 of 4 -

the shortage of public prosecutorial resources i.e. qualified and experienced in the investigation, prosecution and suppression of organized criminal rackets expressly prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 1961 et seq.;

18 USC 1961

(7) how very revealing that CROFTS and MURRAY both manifest that "shortage of public prosecutorial resources," mentioned above, as one of THE main reasons why Congress enacted 18 U.S.C. 1964 in the first place; what hypocrisy!;

18 USC 1964

(8) the U.S. Marshals in San Diego, Spokane, and Seattle did have multiple contacts with the Undersigned, dating at least from 2003;

2003 A.D.

(9) at the fourth meeting with Deputy U.S. Marshals in Seattle, the need for a specific factual update concerning the OMB control number, missing from OPM's electronic SF-61, was discussed openly and mutually recognized by the Undersigned and 2 Deputy U.S. Marshals; the latter wondered out loud whether their own SF-61 credentials were valid or not; the Undersigned did not raise that point;

opm.gov

(10) the pro bono assistance which the Undersigned performed for the U.S. Coast Guard is adequately summarized in his "Executive Summary" to U.S. Coast Guard Investigations at San Diego Harbor, and in thousands of email messages between 2002 and 2009;

USCG
O.O.D.

- 3 of 4 -

- 3 of 4 -

- 4 of 4 -

(11) as fully explained in Rotella supra, private attorneys general are authorized by 18 U.S.C. 1964 to investigate and prosecute organized criminal rackets e.g. even if RICO "predicate acts" are being repeated by persons claiming to be IRS "special agents", and/or claiming to be "officers" of the Clerk of Court at USDCs, Cheyenne, Wyoming, and Seattle, Wash.;

(12) the Undersigned understands the difference between a civil action and a criminal action: the latter would require leave of a Federal Court before the Undersigned could lawfully commence formal criminal proceedings; and,

(13) 18 U.S.C. 4 creates a legal duty in the Undersigned to report evidence of Federal felonies to an officer in the civil, or military, authority of the United States: the RICO "predicate acts" itemized at 18 U.S.C. 1961 are felonies.

Conclusion: CROFTS and MURRY are pathetically ignorant of Civil RICO; and, moreover, both are implicated in the commission of multiple RICO acts themselves, and in aiding and abetting multiple RICO acts by others already named in the official record of the instant case.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Andrew Mitchell, B.A., M.S., Relator Pro Per
Private Attorney General, 18 U.S.C. 1964, Rotella supra.
All Rights Reserved (cf. VCC 1-308)

18 USC 1964

18 USC 1961

18 USC 4
(misprision)

18 USC 1961

18 USC 1961

28 USC 1654

18 USC 1964

VCC 1-308

INMATE NAME: Modelleski, M.P. (given name)
SCOTTS BLUFF COUNTY DETENTION CENTER
PO BOX 130
BERING, NE 69341-0130

#45396

NORTH PLATTE NE 691
20 JUN 2014 PM 1 L



BCDC Disclaims Any Responsibility For
The Nature of the Content of this Correspondence

Re:

#2:14-CR-00027-NDF-2

LEGAL MAIL

To: Office of Clerk of Court
District Court of the United States

2120 Capital Blvd, 2nd Floor

Cheyenne 82001-3658

Atty General, USA

82001

All Rights Reserved
(cf. Sec 1-308)

8200135204

